

# Eigenvalues of the negative $(p, q)$ -Laplacian under a Steklov-like boundary condition

Luminița Barbu and Gheorghe Moroșanu

**Abstract.** In this paper we consider in a bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  with smooth boundary an eigenvalue problem for the negative  $(p, q)$ -Laplacian with a Steklov type boundary condition, where  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $q \in (2, \infty)$  and  $p \neq q$ . A full description of the set of eigenvalues of this problem is provided, thus essentially extending a recent result by Abreu and Madeira [1] related to the  $(p, 2)$ -Laplacian.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010).** 35J60, 35J92, 35P30.

**Keywords.** eigenvalues,  $(p, q)$ -Laplacian, Steklov-like boundary condition, Sobolev space, Nehari manifold, variational methods.

## 1. Introduction

In this paper we investigate the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} Au := -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u = \lambda a(x) |u|^{q-2} u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_A} = \lambda b(x) |u|^{q-2} u & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

under the following hypotheses

$$(H_{pq}) \quad p \in (1, \infty), \quad q \in (2, \infty), \quad p \neq q;$$

$$(H_\Omega) \quad \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N, \quad N \geq 2, \text{ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary } \partial\Omega;$$

$$(H_{ab}) \quad a, b \in L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ are given nonnegative functions satisfying}$$

$$\int_\Omega a(x) \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b(x) \, d\sigma > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

We have denoted

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_A} := (|\nabla u|^{p-2} + |\nabla u|^{q-2}) \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu},$$

where  $\nu$  is the unit outward normal to  $\partial\Omega$ . As usual  $\Delta_p$  denotes the  $p$ -Laplacian, i.e.,  $\Delta_p u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$ . The operator  $\Delta_p + \Delta_q$ , called  $(p, q)$ -Laplacian, occurs in quantum field theory.

The solution  $u$  of (1.1) is understood in a weak sense, as an element of the Sobolev space  $W := W^{1, \max\{p, q\}}(\Omega)$  satisfying equation (1.1)<sub>1</sub> in the sense of distributions and (1.1)<sub>2</sub> in the sense of traces. Using a Green type formula (see [3], p. 71) we can define the concept of an eigenvalue of our problem as follows:

**Definition 1.1.**  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  is an eigenvalue of problem (1.1) if there exists  $u_\lambda \in W \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla u_\lambda|^{p-2} + |\nabla u_\lambda|^{q-2} \right) \nabla u_\lambda \cdot \nabla v \, dx \\ = \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_\lambda|^{q-2} u_\lambda v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^{q-2} u_\lambda v \, d\sigma \right) \forall v \in W. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

Indeed, according to the mentioned Green type formula,  $u \in W$  is a solution of (1.1) if and only if it satisfies (1.3).

Our goal is to determine the set of all eigenvalues of problem (1.1). Fortunately we are able to offer a complete description of this set (see Theorem 3.1 below). It is worth pointing out that this nice result is due to the fact that operator  $A$  is nonhomogeneous ( $p \neq q$ ). The homogeneous case ( $p = q$ ) is more delicate. For example, if  $p = q$ ,  $a \equiv 1$  and  $b \equiv 0$ , then the eigenvalue set of the corresponding (Neumann type) problem is fully known only if  $p = q = 2$ ; otherwise, i.e. if  $p = q \in (1, \infty) \setminus \{2\}$ , then it is only known that, as a consequence of the Ljusternik-Schnirelman theory, there exists a sequence of positive eigenvalues of problem (1.1) with  $A = -2\Delta_p$  (see, e.g., [6]), but this sequence may not constitute the whole eigenvalue set.

Note that the (nonhomogeneous) case

$$p \in (1, \infty), \, q = 2, \, p \neq q$$

has been considered recently by Abreu and Madeira in [1] where the reader can also find some useful historical comments. They assume weaker conditions on  $a$  and  $b$ . In this paper we extend their result to the case  $q > 2$  but we restrict ourselves to functions  $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $b \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$  since assuming weaker regularity for these functions leads to similar results without essential changes. Note that the case

$$p \in (1, \infty), \, q \geq 2, \, p \neq q, \, a \equiv 1, \, b \equiv 0$$

has been solved in three previous papers, [8], [5], [9]. All these previous contributions are particular cases of the main result of this paper (Theorem 3.1).

## 2. Preliminary results

Our hypotheses  $H_{pq}$ ,  $(H_\Omega)$ ,  $(H_{ab})$  will be assumed throughout this paper. If we choose  $v = u_\lambda$  in (1.3) (see Definition 1.1) we observe that the eigenvalues of problem (1.1) cannot be negative numbers. It is also obvious that  $\lambda_0 = 0$  is an eigenvalue of this problem and the corresponding eigenfunctions are the nonzero constant functions. So any other eigenvalue belongs to  $(0, \infty)$ .

If we assume that  $\lambda > 0$  is an eigenvalue of problem (1.1) and choose  $v \equiv 1$  in (1.3) we deduce that every eigenfunction  $u_\lambda$  corresponding to  $\lambda$  satisfies the equation

$$\int_{\Omega} a |u_\lambda|^{q-2} u_\lambda \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^{q-2} u_\lambda \, d\sigma = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

So all eigenfunctions corresponding to positive eigenvalues necessarily belong to the set

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ u \in W; \int_{\Omega} a |u|^{q-2} u \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u|^{q-2} u \, d\sigma = 0 \right\}.$$

This is a symmetric cone and using the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem (see also [2, Theorem 4.9]) we can see that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a weakly closed subset of  $W$ . In addition,  $\mathcal{C}$  has nonzero elements. To show this, we first note that (1.2) implies that either  $|\{x \in \Omega; a(x) > 0\}|_N > 0$  or  $a = 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$  and  $|\{x \in \partial\Omega; b(x) > 0\}|_{N-1} > 0$ , where  $|\cdot|_N$  and  $|\cdot|_{N-1}$  denote the Lebesgue measures of the two sets. In the former case we choose  $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega$ ,  $x_1 \neq x_2$ ,  $r > 0$ , such that  $B_r(x_1) \cap B_r(x_2) = \emptyset$ ,  $B_r(x_k) \subset \Omega$ ,  $|\{x \in B_r(x_k); a(x) > 0\}|_N > 0$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , and consider the test functions  $u_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ ,

$$u_k(x) = \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{r^2 - |x - x_k|^2}}, & \text{if } x \in B_r(x_k), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly  $u_k \in W$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Denote

$$\theta_k = \int_{\Omega} a u_k^{q-1} dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b u_k^{q-1} d\sigma.$$

Obviously  $\theta_k > 0$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Define  $\sigma_k = \theta_k^{-\frac{1}{q-1}}$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . It is then easily seen that the function  $v = \sigma_1 u_1 - \sigma_2 u_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Of course,  $tv \in \mathcal{C}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . A similar construction can be used in the later case, where restrictions of similar test functions to  $B_r(x_k) \cap \partial\Omega$ ,  $x_k \in \partial\Omega$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , can be considered.

*Remark 2.1.* If for some  $\lambda > 0$   $u \in W \setminus \{0\}$  satisfies the equation

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^p + |\nabla u|^q) dx = \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u|^q d\sigma \right),$$

then  $u$  cannot be a constant function (see (1.2)) and so

$$\int_{\Omega} a |u|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u|^q d\sigma > 0.$$

Therefore, denoting  $\Gamma_1(u) := \{x \in \Omega; a(x)u(x) \neq 0\}$ ,  $\Gamma_2(u) := \{x \in \partial\Omega; b(x)u(x) \neq 0\}$ , we see that either  $|\Gamma_1(u)|_N > 0$  or  $|\Gamma_2(u)|_{N-1} > 0$ .

Obviously  $u_\lambda$  corresponding to any eigenvalue  $\lambda > 0$  cannot be a constant function (see (1.3) with  $v = u_\lambda$  and (1.2)).

Now, for  $r > 1$  define the set

$$\mathcal{C}_r := \left\{ u \in W^{1,r}(\Omega); \int_{\Omega} a |u|^{r-2} u dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u|^{r-2} u d\sigma = 0 \right\}.$$

Arguing as before, we infer that for all  $r > 0$   $\mathcal{C}_r$  is a symmetric, weakly closed (in  $W^{1,r}(\Omega)$ ) cone, containing infinitely many nonzero elements.

Note also that  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_q$  if  $q > p$ , otherwise (i.e., if  $q < p$ )  $\mathcal{C}$  is a proper subset of  $\mathcal{C}_q$ .

Now let us define,

$$\mathcal{C}_{1q} := \mathcal{C}_q \cap \left\{ u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega); \int_{\Omega} a |u|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u|^q d\sigma = 1 \right\}.$$

This set is nonempty. Indeed, let us suppose that  $|\{x \in \Omega; a(x) > 0\}|_N > 0$  and choose  $v = \sigma_1 u_1 - \sigma_2 u_2$  as before. We have  $v \in \mathcal{C}_q$  and  $\int_{\Omega} a |v|^q dx > 0$  so there exists a  $t_* > 0$  such that

$$t_*^q \left( \int_{\Omega} a |v|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^q d\sigma \right) = 1.$$

Therefore  $t_* v \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}$ . A similar conclusion is obtained if  $a = 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$  but  $|\{x \in \partial\Omega; b(x) > 0\}|_{N-1} > 0$ .

Consider the minimization problem

$$\inf_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}} J(w), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $J : W^{1,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by  $J(w) := \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^q dx$ . Functional  $J$  is positively homogeneous of order  $q$ , convex and weakly lower semicontinuous. The next result states that  $J$  attains its minimal value and this value is positive.

**Lemma 2.2.** *For each  $q > 1$  there exists  $u^* \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}$  such that  $J(u^*) = \inf_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}} J(w) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* It is well-known that functional  $J$  is of class  $C^1$  on  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  and obviously  $J$  is bounded below. Let  $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{C}_{1q}$  be a minimizing sequence for  $J$ , i. e.,

$$J(u_n) \rightarrow \inf_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}} J(w) := \sigma.$$

We can prove that  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Assume the contrary, that there exists a subsequence of  $(u_n)$ , again denoted  $(u_n)$ , such that  $\|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Define

$$v_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega)}} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Clearly sequence  $(v_n)$  is bounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  so there exist a  $v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  and a subsequence of  $(v_n)$ , again denoted  $(v_n)$ , such that

$$v_n \rightharpoonup v \text{ in } W^{1,q}(\Omega),$$

$$v_n \rightarrow v \text{ in } L^q(\Omega), \quad v_n \rightarrow v \text{ in } L^q(\partial\Omega).$$

As  $\|v_n\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = 1 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $\|v\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = 1$ , and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^q dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^q dx = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q} J(u_n) = 0,$$

which shows that  $v$  is a constant function. On the other hand, since  $(v_n) \subset \mathcal{C}_q$  and  $\mathcal{C}_q$  is weakly closed in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , we infer that  $v \in \mathcal{C}_q$ , hence  $v \equiv 0$ . But this contradicts the fact that  $\|v\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = 1$ . Therefore,  $(u_n)$  is indeed bounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , hence there exist  $u^* \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  and a subsequence of  $(u_n)$ , which is also denoted  $(u_n)$ , such that

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u^* \text{ in } W^{1,q}(\Omega),$$

$$u_n \rightarrow u^* \text{ in } L^q(\Omega), \quad u_n \rightarrow u^* \text{ in } L^q(\partial\Omega).$$

By Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem we obtain  $u^* \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}$ , so the weak lower semicontinuity of  $J$  leads to  $\sigma = J(u^*)$ . In addition  $J(u^*) > 0$ . Indeed, assuming by contradiction that  $J(u^*) = 0$  would imply that  $u^* \equiv \text{Const.}$ , which is impossible because  $u^* \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.3.* For  $p, q, \Omega$  satisfying our assumptions define

$$\lambda_1 := \inf_{w \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^q dx}{\int_{\Omega} a |w|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |w|^q d\sigma}, \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 := \inf_{w \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^q dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^p dx}{\frac{1}{q} \left( \int_{\Omega} a |w|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |w|^q d\sigma \right)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that the denominators of the above fractions may equal zero for some  $w$ 's in  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and in such cases the corresponding numerators are obviously  $\neq 0$  thus the values of those fractions are considered  $\infty$  so they do not contribute to  $\lambda_1$  or  $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ .

In fact  $\lambda_1 = \tilde{\lambda}_1$ . Indeed, it is obvious that  $\lambda_1 \leq \tilde{\lambda}_1$  and for the converse inequality we note that  $\forall v \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}, t > 0$ , we have  $tv \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_1 &= \inf_{w \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^q dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^p dx}{\frac{1}{q} \left( \int_{\Omega} a |w|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |w|^q d\sigma \right)} \leq \\ &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^q dx}{\int_{\Omega} a |v|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^q d\sigma} + t^{p-q} \frac{q \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^p dx}{p \left( \int_{\Omega} a |w|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^q d\sigma \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if  $q > p$ , and  $t \rightarrow 0$  if  $q < p$ , then passing to infimum for  $v \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$  we get the desired inequality. Therefore  $\lambda_1$  can be expressed in two different ways (see (2.3) and (2.4)).

*Remark 2.4.* As a consequence of Lemma 2.2 we have  $\lambda_1 > 0$ . Indeed,

$$\lambda_1 := \inf_{w \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^q dx,$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \{v \in \mathcal{C}; \int_{\Omega} a |\nabla v|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |\nabla v|^q d\sigma = 1\}$ . So  $\lambda_1 = J(u^*)$  for  $p \leq q$  and  $\lambda_1 \geq J(u^*)$  if  $p > q$ . Thus in both cases  $\lambda_1 > 0$ .

Now we recall a result which is known as the Lagrange multiplier rule (see, e.g., [10, Thm. 2.2.18, p. 78]).

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $X, Y$  be real Banach spaces and let  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be Fréchet differentiable,  $g \in C^1(D, Y)$ , where  $D \subseteq X$  is a nonempty open set. If  $v_0$  is a local minimizer of the constraint problem*

$$\min f(v), \quad g(v) = 0,$$

*and  $\mathcal{R}(g'(v_0))$  (the range of  $g'(v_0)$ ) is closed, then there exist  $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y^* \in Y^*$  not both equal to zero such that*

$$\lambda^* f'(v_0) + y^* \circ g'(v_0) = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

*where  $Y^*$  stands for the dual of  $Y$ .*

**Remark 2.6.** Define

$$\|u\|_{ab} := \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \left( \|a^{1/q}u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q + \|b^{1/q}u\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}^q \right)^{1/q} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad (2.6)$$

If  $p > q$  and  $a, b$  satisfy  $(H_{ab})$  then (2.6) is a norm in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  equivalent with the usual norm of this space. This fact follows from [4, Proposition 3.9.55]. Indeed, the seminorm

$$w(u) := \left( \|a^{1/q}u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q + \|b^{1/q}u\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}^q \right)^{1/q} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

satisfies the two requirements of that proposition

- (i)  $\exists d > 0$  such that  $w(u) \leq d \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ , and
- (ii) if  $u = \text{constant}$ , then  $w(u) = 0$  implies  $u \equiv 0$ .

### 3. The main result

Let us state the main result of this paper:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that  $(H_{pq})$ ,  $(H_\Omega)$  and  $(H_{ab})$  above are fulfilled. Then the set of eigenvalues of problem (1.1) is  $\{0\} \cup (\lambda_1, \infty)$ , where  $\lambda_1$  is the positive constant defined by (2.3).*

*Proof.* We have already said that  $\lambda_0 = 0$  is an eigenvalue of problem (1.1) and any other eigenvalue of this problem belongs to  $(0, \infty)$ . Let us first prove that there is no eigenvalue of problem (1.1) in  $(0, \lambda_1]$ . Assume by contradiction that there exists an eigenvalue  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1]$  and let  $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$  be a corresponding eigenfunction. Choosing  $v = u_\lambda$  in (1.3) yields

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_\lambda|^p + |\nabla u_\lambda|^q) dx = \lambda \left( \int_\Omega a |u_\lambda|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^q d\sigma \right). \quad (3.1)$$

Note that  $\int_\Omega a |u_\lambda|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^q d\sigma \neq 0$ , otherwise  $u_\lambda \equiv \text{Const.}$  (cf. (3.1)) which is impossible (see Remark 2.1). On the other hand, as  $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , we derive from (2.3) and (3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \leq \lambda_1 &\leq \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^q dx}{\int_\Omega a |u_\lambda|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^q d\sigma} \\ &= \frac{\lambda \left( \int_\Omega a |u_\lambda|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^q d\sigma \right) - \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^p dx}{\int_\Omega a |u_\lambda|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^q d\sigma} \\ &= \lambda - \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^p dx}{\int_\Omega a |u_\lambda|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^q d\sigma} < \lambda, \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly impossible.

In what follows we shall prove that every  $\lambda > \lambda_1$  is an eigenvalue of problem (1.1). To this purpose we fix such a  $\lambda$  and define the functional  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^q dx - \frac{\lambda}{q} \left( \int_\Omega a |u|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u|^q d\sigma \right).$$

It is easily seen that functional  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda \in C^1(W \setminus \{0\}; \mathbb{R})$  (even more,  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda \in C^1(W; \mathbb{R})$  if  $2 < q < p$ ) and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{J}'_\lambda(u), v \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx \\ &\quad - \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u|^{q-2} uv \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^{q-2} uv \, d\sigma \right) \quad \forall v \in W, \quad u \in W \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

So, according to Definition 1.1,  $\lambda > \lambda_1$  is an eigenvalue of problem (1.1) if and only if there exists a critical point  $u_\lambda \in W \setminus \{0\}$  of  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$ , i. e.  $\mathcal{J}'_\lambda(u_\lambda) = 0$ .

We shall discuss two cases which are complementary to each other.

**Case 1:**  $2 < q < p$ . We shall prove that in this case functional  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  is coercive on  $\mathcal{C} \subset W = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ , i. e.,

$$\lim_{\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty, u \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(u) = \infty.$$

To this purpose we define  $T_1, T_2, T_3 : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows

$$T_1(u) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \, dx, \quad T_2(u) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q \, dx, \quad T_3(u) = \int_{\Omega} a |u|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_\lambda|^q \, d\sigma,$$

$$\text{so } \mathcal{J}_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{p} T_1(u) + \frac{1}{q} T_2(u) - \frac{\lambda}{q} T_3(u).$$

We know from Remark 2.6 that the usual norm of  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ , denoted  $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}$ , is equivalent with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{ab}$  defined in (2.6). Thus  $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $\|u\|_{ab} = T_1(u)^{1/p} + T_3(u)^{1/q} \rightarrow \infty$ . From (2.3) we then have

$$\lambda_1 T_3(u) \leq T_2(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (3.2)$$

hence

$$\frac{1}{p} T_1(u) + \frac{1}{q} T_2(u) \geq \frac{1}{p} (T_1(u) + T_2(u)) \geq \frac{1}{p} (1 + \lambda_1) (T_1(u) + T_3(u)),$$

which implies

$$\lim_{\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty, u \in \mathcal{C}} \left( \frac{1}{p} T_1(u) + \frac{1}{q} T_2(u) \right) = \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

By Hölder's inequality we have,

$$T_2(u) \leq |\Omega|^{(p-q)/p} T_1(u)^{q/p} \quad \forall u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

so it follows from (3.3)

$$\lim_{\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty, u \in \mathcal{C}} T_1(u) = \infty. \quad (3.4)$$

So, we obtain from (3.2) and Hölder's inequality

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u) \geq \frac{1}{p} T_1(u) + \frac{1}{q} T_2(u) - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1 q} T_2(u) \geq \frac{1}{p} T_1(u) - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1 q} |\Omega|^{(p-q)/p} T_1(u)^{q/p}.$$

Since  $q < p$  the right-hand side of the above inequality tends to  $\infty$  as  $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$  (cf. (3.4)) so  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  is indeed coercive on  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We note that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a weakly closed subset of the reflexive Banach space  $W = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ , and functional  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  is weakly lower semicontinuous on  $\mathcal{C}$  with respect to the norm of  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ . So  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  has a global minimizer  $u_* \in \mathcal{C}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_*) = \min_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{J}_\lambda$  (see, e.g., [11, Theorem 1.2]). From Remark 2.3 we know that  $\lambda_1 = \tilde{\lambda}_1$ , hence (2.4) as  $\lambda > \lambda_1 = \tilde{\lambda}_1$ . Then (by (2.4)) there exists  $u_{0\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_{0\lambda}) < 0$ . It follows that

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_*) \leq \mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_{0\lambda}) < 0,$$

which shows that  $u_* \neq 0$ . In fact  $u_*$  is a solution of the minimization problem

$$\min_{v \in W} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(v),$$

under the restriction

$$g(v) := \int_{\Omega} a |v|^{q-2} v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^{q-2} v \, d\sigma = 0.$$

We can apply Lemma 2.5 with  $X = W$ ,  $D = W$ ,  $Y = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f = \mathcal{J}_{\lambda}$ ,  $g : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  being the function just defined above, and  $v_0 = u_*$ , on the condition that  $\mathcal{R}(g'(u_*))$  is a closed set. In fact we can show that  $g'(u_*)$  is surjective, i.e.,  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists a  $w \in W$  such that

$$\langle g'(u_*), w \rangle = c.$$

We seek  $w$  of the form  $w = u_* + \beta$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus we obtain from the above equation (using  $u_* \in \mathcal{C}$ )

$$\beta(q-1) \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} \, d\sigma \right) = c,$$

which has a unique solution  $\beta$  since

$$\int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} \, d\sigma \neq 0,$$

otherwise  $\mathcal{J}_{\lambda}(u_*) = p^{-1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^p + q^{-1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^q \, dx$  which contradicts  $\mathcal{J}_{\lambda}(u_*) < 0$ . Thus  $g'(u_*)$  is surjective, as claimed. By Lemma 2.5 there exist  $\lambda^*, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ , not both equal to zero, such that

$$\lambda^* \langle \mathcal{J}'_{\lambda}(u_*), v \rangle + \mu \langle g'(u_*), v \rangle = 0, \quad \forall v \in W = W^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

or, equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^* \left( \int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla u_*|^{p-2} + |\nabla u_*|^{q-2} \right) \nabla u_* \cdot \nabla v \, dx, \right. \\ \left. - \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, d\sigma \right) \right) \\ + \mu(q-1) \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} v \, d\sigma \right) = 0 \quad \forall v \in W. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $v \equiv 1$  in the above equality and taking into account the fact that  $u_* \in \mathcal{C}$  we get

$$\mu \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} \, d\sigma \right) = 0,$$

which implies  $\mu = 0$ . Therefore  $\lambda^* \neq 0$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla u_*|^{p-2} + |\nabla u_*|^{q-2} \right) \nabla u_* \cdot \nabla v \, dx, \\ - \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, d\sigma \right) = 0 \quad \forall v \in W, \end{aligned}$$

i. e.,  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of problem (1.1)

**Case 2:**  $q > 2$ ,  $1 < p < q$ . In this case  $W = W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Let  $\lambda > \lambda_1$  be a fixed number. In this case we cannot expect coercivity on  $W$  for functional  $\mathcal{J}_{\lambda}$  which obviously belongs to  $C^1(W \setminus \{0\}; \mathbb{R})$ . We shall prove that  $\mathcal{J}_{\lambda}$  has a critical point in  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . To this purpose we consider a Nehari type manifold (see [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{\lambda} &= \{v \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}; \langle \mathcal{J}'_{\lambda}(v), v \rangle = 0\} \\ &= \left\{ v \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}; \int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla v|^p + |\nabla v|^q \right) \, dx = \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |v|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^q \, d\sigma \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is natural to consider the restriction of  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  to  $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$  as any possible eigenfunction corresponding to  $\lambda$  belongs to  $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$ . Note that on  $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$  functional  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u) &= \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \, dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q \, dx - \frac{\lambda}{q} \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u|^q \, d\sigma \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \, dx - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q \, dx = \frac{q-p}{qp} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \, dx > 0.\end{aligned}$$

We shall prove that there exists a point  $u_* \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  where  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  attains its minimal value,  $m_\lambda := \inf_{w \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(w)$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_\lambda(u_*) = 0$ . The proof relies on essentially known and new arguments, and is divided into several steps as follows.

**Step 1.**  $\mathcal{N}_\lambda \neq \emptyset$ .

Indeed, since  $\lambda > \lambda_1$ , we deduce from (2.3) that there exists a  $v_0 \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^q \, dx < \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |v_0|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v_0|^q \, d\sigma \right).$$

We claim that for a convenient  $t > 0$ ,  $tv_0 \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cone,  $tv_0 \in \mathcal{C}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . So the condition  $tv_0 \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$ ,  $t > 0$ , reads

$$t^p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^p \, dx + t^q \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^q \, dx = \lambda t^q \left( \int_{\Omega} a |v_0|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v_0|^q \, d\sigma \right).$$

This equation can be solved for  $t$ ,

$$t = \left( \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^p \, dx}{\lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |v_0|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v_0|^q \, d\sigma \right) - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^q \, dx} \right)^{1/(q-p)}, \quad (3.5)$$

and hence for this  $t$  we have  $tv_0 \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$ .

**Step 2.** Every minimizing sequence  $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  for  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  is bounded in  $W = W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ .

Let  $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  be such a minimizing sequence for  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$ . Since  $u_n \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  for all  $n$ , we have

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_n) = \frac{q-p}{qp} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p \, dx \rightarrow m_\lambda, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}0 &< \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_n|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_n|^q \, d\sigma \right) - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^q \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p \, dx \rightarrow \frac{qp}{q-p} m_\lambda, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Assume by contradiction that  $(u_n)$  is unbounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Then, on a subsequence, again denoted  $(u_n)$ , we have  $\|u_n\|_{ab} \rightarrow \infty$  (for details on  $\|\cdot\|_{ab}$  see Remark 2.6). It follows from (3.7) that (on a subsequence)

$$c_n := \left( \|a^{1/q} u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q + \|b^{1/q} u_n\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}^q \right)^{1/q} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Denote  $v_n = u_n/c_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . From (3.7) we have  $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^q \, dx \leq \lambda$  for all  $n$ , so  $(v_n)$  is bounded with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{ab}$ , which is equivalent to the usual norm of  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . So there exists a  $v_0 \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  such that  $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$  in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  (hence also in  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ ). Obviously,  $v_n \rightarrow v_0$  in  $L^q(\Omega)$  and also in  $L^q(\partial\Omega)$ . As  $\mathcal{C}$  is weakly closed in  $W$  and  $(v_n) \subset \mathcal{C}$  we also have  $v_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ . Now, from (3.7) we deduce  $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^p \, dx \rightarrow 0$ , and so

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^p \, dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^p \, dx = 0.$$

Therefore  $v_0$  is a constant function. In fact  $v_0 \equiv 0$  since  $v_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ . It follows that  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^q(\Omega)$  and in  $L^q(\partial\Omega)$ , which contradicts the fact that

$$\| a^{1/q} v_n \|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q + \| b^{1/q} v_n \|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}^q = 1 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

**Step 3.**  $m_\lambda := \inf_{w \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(w) > 0$ .

Assume that, on the contrary,  $m_\lambda = 0$ . Let  $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  be a minimizing sequence for  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$ . We have (see (3.7))

$$0 < \lambda \left( \int_\Omega a |u_n|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_n|^q d\sigma \right) - \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^q dx = \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p dx \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.8)$$

We know from Step 2 that  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , so there exists  $u_0 \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  such that, on a subsequence denoted again  $(u_n)$ ,  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$  in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  (hence also in  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ ), and  $u_n \rightarrow u_0$  in  $L^q(\Omega)$ ,  $u_n \rightarrow u_0$  in  $L^q(\partial\Omega)$ . Clearly  $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}$  and from (3.8) we deduce that  $u_0$  is a constant function, so  $u_0 \equiv 0$ . Summarizing, we have proved that  $u_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . As in the previous step, we define  $v_n = u_n/c_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that  $c_n > 0$  for all  $n$  (otherwise, by (3.8) all the  $u_n$ 's will be constant functions, which is impossible since they belong to  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$ ). By (3.8) we see that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^q dx < \lambda \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

so  $(v_n)$  is bounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . As  $(v_n)$  is a sequence in  $\mathcal{C}$  which is weakly closed in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , it follows that there exists a  $v_0 \in \mathcal{C}$  such that, on a subsequence,  $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$  in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  and  $v_n \rightarrow v_0$  in  $L^q(\Omega)$  as well as in  $L^q(\partial\Omega)$ . Now, we divide (3.8) by  $c_n^q$  to obtain

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^p dx = c_n^{q-p} [\lambda - \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^q dx] \rightarrow 0.$$

Next, since  $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$  in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  (hence also in  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ ), we infer that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_0|^p dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^p dx = 0.$$

Therefore  $v_0$  is a constant function and in fact  $v_0 \equiv 0$  since  $v_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ . Thus,  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in both  $L^q(\Omega)$  and  $L^q(\partial\Omega)$ . But this contradicts the fact that

$$\| a^{1/q} v_n \|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q + \| b^{1/q} v_n \|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}^q = 1 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This contradiction shows that  $m_\lambda > 0$ .

**Step 4.** There exists  $u_* \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  such that  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_*) = m_\lambda$ .

Let  $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  be a minimizing sequence:  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow m_\lambda$ . By Step 3  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Thus, on a subsequenc,  $(u_n)$  converges weakly in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  to some  $u_* \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  and strongly in both  $L^q(\Omega)$  and  $L^q(\partial\Omega)$  (to the same  $u_*$ ). Thus,

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_*) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_n) = m_\lambda. \quad (3.9)$$

As  $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  we have

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^p + |\nabla u_n|^q) dx = \lambda \left( \int_\Omega a |u_n|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_n|^q d\sigma \right), \quad (3.10)$$

$$\int_\Omega a |u_n|^{q-2} u_n dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_n|^{q-2} u_n d\sigma = 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.11)$$

It is easily seen that  $u_*$  is not the null function. Indeed, assuming that  $u_* \equiv 0$ , we infer by (3.10) that  $(u_n)$  converges strongly to 0 in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , hence also in  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ . Then (3.6) will give  $m_\lambda = 0$  thus contradicting the statement of Step 3. Obviously  $u_* \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.10) yields

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_*|^p + |\nabla u_*|^q) dx \leq \lambda \left( \int_\Omega a |u_*|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^q d\sigma \right). \quad (3.12)$$

If (3.12) holds with equality then we are done (cf. (3.9)). We shall prove that assuming strict inequality in (3.12) leads to a contradiction. Thus, let us assume that

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_*|^p + |\nabla u_*|^q) dx < \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^q d\sigma \right). \quad (3.13)$$

If we choose  $t$  as in (3.5) with  $u_*$  instead of  $v_0$ , we have  $tu_* \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  with  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Next, using the form of  $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$  on the Nehari manifold  $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$ , we get

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(tu_*) = \frac{q-p}{qp} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla tu_*|^p dx = t^p \frac{q-p}{qp} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^p dx. \quad (3.14)$$

In addition,

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_n) = \frac{q-p}{qp} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p dx \Rightarrow m_\lambda = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_n) \geq \frac{q-p}{qp} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^p dx.$$

Therefore,

$$0 < m_\lambda \leq \mathcal{J}_\lambda(tu_*) = t^p \frac{q-p}{qp} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^p dx \leq t^p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(u_n) = t^p m_\lambda < m_\lambda,$$

which is impossible.

**Step 5.** If  $u_* \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  is the minimizer determined in Step 4, then  $\mathcal{J}'_\lambda(u_*) = 0$ .

In fact  $u_*$  is a solution of the minimization problem

$$\min_{v \in W} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(v),$$

with the restrictions

$$g_1(v) := \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla v|^p + |\nabla v|^q) dx - \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |v|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^q d\sigma \right) = 0, \quad (3.15)$$

$$g_2(v) := \int_{\Omega} a |v|^{q-2} v dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^{q-2} v d\sigma = 0. \quad (3.16)$$

We shall use again Lemma 2.5, this time with  $X = W$ ,  $Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $D = W \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $f = \mathcal{J}_\lambda$ ,  $g = (g_1, g_2)$  where  $g_1, g_2$  are defined above,  $x_0 = u_*$ . All the assumptions of Lemma 2.5 can be checked easily, except the fact that  $g'(u_*)$  has closed range. In fact we shall prove more, that  $g'(u_*)$  is surjective, i.e.,  $\forall (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  there exists a  $w \in W$  such that

$$\langle g'_1(u_*), w \rangle = c_1, \quad \langle g'_2(u_*), w \rangle = c_2.$$

If we choose in the above equations  $w$  of the form  $w = \alpha u_* + \beta$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and take into account the fact that  $u_* \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$ , we obtain the following algebraic system

$$\alpha(p-q) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^p dx = c_1, \quad \beta(q-1) \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} d\sigma \right) = c_2,$$

which has a unique solution  $(\alpha, \beta)$  (from Remark 2.1 and  $u_* \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$  we see that the coefficients of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are  $\neq 0$ ). Thus  $g'(u_*)$  is indeed surjective and so Lemma 2.5 is applicable to the above constraint minimization problem. Therefore there exist  $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , not both equal to zero, such that

$$\lambda^* \langle \mathcal{J}'_\lambda(u_*), v \rangle + \mu_1 \langle g'_1(u_*), v \rangle + \mu_2 \langle g'_2(u_*), v \rangle = 0, \quad \forall v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega),$$

or, equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^* \left[ \int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla u_*|^{p-2} + |\nabla u_*|^{q-2} \right) \nabla u_* \cdot \nabla v \, dx - \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, d\sigma \right) \right] \\ + \mu_1 \left[ p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^{p-2} \nabla u_* \cdot \nabla v \, dx + q \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^{q-2} \nabla u_* \cdot \nabla v \, dx \right. \\ \left. - q \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, d\sigma \right) \right] \\ + \mu_2 (q-1) \left[ \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} v \, d\sigma \right] = 0 \quad \forall v \in W. \end{aligned}$$

Testing with  $v \equiv 1$  in the above equation and taking into account the fact that  $u_* \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}$  we find

$$\mu_2 (q-1) \left[ \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} \, d\sigma \right) \right] = 0,$$

which implies  $\mu_2 = 0$  (since the coefficient of  $\mu_2$  in the above equation  $\neq 0$ ; see (3.15) with  $v = u_*$  and Remark 2.1).

Next, we test with  $v = u_*$  and use (3.16) with  $v = u_*$  to obtain

$$\mu_1 (p-q) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^p \, dx = 0,$$

which implies  $\mu_1 = 0$ . Therefore,  $\lambda^* \neq 0$ , hence

$$\int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla u_*|^{p-2} + |\nabla u_*|^{q-2} \right) \nabla u_* \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_*|^{q-2} u_* v \, d\sigma \right),$$

$\forall v \in W$ , i. e.  $\lambda$  is indeed an eigenvalue of problem (1.1). This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* Assume that  $(H_{\Omega})$ ,  $(H_{ab})$  are fulfilled and  $q \geq 2$ . We can show that, if in addition  $1 < p < q$ , then  $\lambda_1$  (defined in (2.3)) is in fact the first positive eigenvalue of the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_q u = \lambda a(x) |u|^{q-2} u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ |\nabla u|^{q-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \lambda b(x) |u|^{q-2} u & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

As in the case of problem (1.1),  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  is called an eigenvalue of problem (3.17) if there exists  $u_{\lambda} \in W^{1,q}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\lambda}|^{q-2} \nabla u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_{\lambda}|^{q-2} u_{\lambda} v \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_{\lambda}|^{q-2} u_{\lambda} v \, d\sigma \right) \quad \forall v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega). \quad (3.18)$$

Obviously,  $\lambda_0 = 0$  is an eigenvalue of (3.17) and any other eigenvalue of this problem is positive (cf. (3.18) with  $v = u_{\lambda}$ ). For  $q \geq 2$ , we can use Lemma 2.5 to show that the first positive eigenvalue of (3.17) is given by

$$\lambda_{1q} := \inf_{v \in \mathcal{C}_q \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^q \, dx}{\int_{\Omega} a |v|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^q \, d\sigma}. \quad (3.19)$$

First of all we see that there is no eigenvalue of (3.17) in the interval  $(0, \lambda_{1q})$ . Assume the contrary, that there exists a  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_{1q})$  which is an eigenvalue and let  $u_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}_q \setminus \{0\}$  be a corresponding eigenfunction. If we choose in (3.18)  $v = u_{\lambda}$  we get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\lambda}|^q \, dx = \mu \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u_{\lambda}|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_{\lambda}|^q \, d\sigma \right). \quad (3.20)$$

As  $u_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}_q \setminus \{0\}$ , we have (see (3.19))

$$\lambda < \lambda_{1q} \leq \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\lambda}|^q \, dx}{\int_{\Omega} a |u_{\lambda}|^q \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u_{\lambda}|^q \, d\sigma} = \lambda,$$

contradiction. Now, let us prove that  $\lambda_{1q}$  is an eigenvalue of (3.17). We know from Lemma 2.2 that there exists  $u^* \in \mathcal{C}_{1q} \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\lambda_{1q} = J(u^*) = \min_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{1q}} J(v).$$

We can prove that  $J'(u^*) = 0$ . To this purpose we apply Lemma 2.5 to problem (2.2) with the constraints:

$$h_1(v) = \int_{\Omega} a |v|^q dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^q d\sigma - 1 = 0, \quad (3.21)$$

$$h_2(v) = \int_{\Omega} a |v|^{q-2} v dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |v|^{q-2} v d\sigma = 0. \quad (3.22)$$

Choose  $X = W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ ,  $Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $D = X$ ,  $f = J$ ,  $g = (h_1, h_2)$ ,  $x_0 = u^*$ . One can show by arguments similar to those used before that  $g'(u^*)$  is surjective, so all the requirements of Lemma 2.5 are fulfilled. So there exist  $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , not both equal to zero such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^* q \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^*|^{q-2} \nabla u^* \nabla v dx + \mu_1 q \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u^*|^{q-2} u^* v dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u^*|^{q-2} u^* v d\sigma \right) \\ + \mu_2 (q-1) \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u^*|^{q-2} v dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u^*|^{q-2} v d\sigma \right) = 0 \quad \forall v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega), \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Testing with  $v = 1$  in (3.23) and observing that  $u^*$  satisfies (3.22), we deduce that  $\mu_2 = 0$ . Finally, choosing  $v = u^*$  in (3.23) and noting that  $u^*$  satisfies (3.21) we find  $\lambda^* \lambda_{1q} + \mu_1 = 0$ , where  $\mu_1 \neq 0$ ,  $\lambda^* \neq 0$ . Replacing  $\mu_1 = -\lambda^* \lambda_{1q}$ ,  $\mu_2 = 0$  in (3.23), we get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^*|^{q-2} \nabla u^* \nabla v dx - \lambda_{1q} \left( \int_{\Omega} a |u^*|^{q-2} u^* v dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} b |u^*|^{q-2} u^* v d\sigma \right) \quad \forall v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega),$$

i. e.,  $(\lambda_{1q}, u^*)$  is an eigenpair of problem (3.17).

Thus, if  $q \geq 2$  and  $1 < p < q$  then  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_{1q}$ , so the eigenvalue set of problem (1.1) is  $\{0\} \cup (\lambda_{1q}, \infty)$ , which is independent of  $p$ . If  $2 \leq q < p$  then  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_{1q}$ .

## References

- [1] J. Abreu, G. Madeira, Generalized eigenvalues of the  $(p, 2)$ -Laplacian under a parametric boundary condition, arXiv:1507.03299v2 [math.AP] 23 Mar 2016.
- [2] H. Brezis, Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations, Springer, 2011.
- [3] E. Casas, L. A. Fernández, A Green's formula for quasilinear elliptic operators, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 142, 62-73, 1989.
- [4] Z. Denkowski, S. Migórski, N. S. Papageorgiou, An Introduction to Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Springer, New York, 2003.
- [5] M. Fărcășeanu, M. Mihăilescu, D. Stancu-Dumitru, On the set of eigenvalues of some PDEs with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition, Nonlinear Analysis, 116, 19-25, 2015.
- [6] A. Lê, Eigenvalue problems for  $p$ -Laplacian, Nonlinear Analysis, 64, 1057-1099, 2006.
- [7] L. Gasinski, N. S. Papageorgiou, Nonlinear Analysis, Chapman and Hall/CRC Taylor and Francis Group, Boca Raton, 2005.
- [8] M. Mihăilescu, An eigenvalue problem possessing a continuous family of eigenvalues plus an isolated eigenvalue, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 10, 701-708, 2011.
- [9] M. Mihăilescu, G. Moroșanu, Eigenvalues of  $-\Delta_p - \Delta_q$  under Neumann boundary condition, Canadian Math. Bull., 59(3), 606-616, 2016.
- [10] N. S. Papageorgiou, S. Th. Kyritsi-Yiallourou, Handbook on Applied Analysis. Advances in Mechanics and Mathematics, 19, Springer, New York, 2009.
- [11] M. Struwe, Variational Methods: Applications to Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Hamiltonian Systems, Springer, 1996.
- [12] A. Szulkin, T. Weth, The Method of Nehari Manifold, Handbook of Nonconvex Analysis and Applications, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 597-632, 2010.

Luminița Barbu

Ovidius University, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science,  
124 Mamaia Blvd, 900527 Constanța, Romania  
e-mail: [lbarbu@univ-ovidius.ro](mailto:lbarbu@univ-ovidius.ro)

Gheorghe Moroșanu

Central European University, Department of Mathematics,  
Nador u. 9, 1051 Budapest, Hungary  
e-mail: [morosanug@ceu.edu](mailto:morosanug@ceu.edu)